

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2005
ABLONDI ROOM**

Attendance: Christopher C. Ross, Chair; Katherine E. Murphy, Vice-Chair; Charles J. Sisitsky, Clerk; Dr. Esther A. H. Hopkins, Member

Staff: George P. King, Jr., Town Manager; Mark J. Purple, Assistant Town Manager; Matthew A. Romero, Executive Assistant

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM. Mr. Ross noted that there would be no meeting the following week, and the Board would reconvene on March 3, 2005, and reviewed the agenda.

Public Participation

Robert Edwards

Mr. Edwards discussed the Department of Public Health's (DPH's) latest report on head injuries. Mr. Edwards felt that people needed to do more to protect themselves from brain injuries, and informed the public that March was Brain Injury Awareness Month.

Gary and Elaine Weber

Mr. Weber had a question on Town policy. On Sunday evening, the couple found a stray dog. They received no satisfaction from the Police Department, and Animal Control could not be located after multiple calls to both departments. The police dispatcher instructed her to let him go, and she felt it was an inappropriate response. Mr. Romero noted that he had passed the complaint on to Chief Carl, who had called him back, and was working on it internally. Mr. Ross agreed that the Police should respond to that kind of call, and they are the first responders in that case, especially since Animal Control was not a 24/7 operation. Mr. Ross agreed that there was a question of what should have been done in the situation, and suggested that it be looked into.

Robert O'Neill

Mr. O'Neill spoke on using a comparative governmental approach to improving governmental efficiency, and cited other municipalities as examples for the Town to follow.

Robert H. Bowles

Mr. Bowles stated that he was angry and upset and wanted to address the Board and all viewers to discuss the articles that had been in the paper regarding the Town Manager's contract. He felt the Board should rescind the decision immediately.

Joe Rizoli

Dr. Hopkins had sent us an e-mail asking for some of the facts regarding illegal immigration. Mr. Rizoli pointed to a summit on Brazilian culture at Harvard University, and claimed that "most Brazilians are undocumented." He read from a letter to the newspaper that he had submitted asking for an ad hoc committee. Mr. Ross encouraged him to form an ad hoc committee as he had suggested.

Jim Rizoli

Mr. Rizoli noted that in Salinas, California there were so many illegal immigrants that the libraries were being closed. He felt that as the illegal immigrant population grew, the Town would have to support them, and a similar situation might result.

Consideration of an alcohol violation for Pepperoncini's (486 Concord Street)

Chief Carl read his memorandum to the Board summarizing Pepperoncini's violation of the Town's Alcohol Policy on October 6, 2004. The Police Department's (PD's) recommendation was:

1. A five-day suspension of the license.
2. A \$300.00 cost for the investigation.
3. Manager to make sure that all servers were trained and registered with the PD.
4. Proper signage posted on the premises during the suspension period indicating the charged violation that was the cause of the suspension.

Dr. Hopkins questioned if it was standard to issue a 5-day violation for illegally consuming alcoholic beverages. Dr. Hopkins questioned how the behavior had been determined to be inappropriate, and Chief Carl pointed out that the behavior had been judged inappropriate and people were arrested and convicted for it in other cases, but he could not discuss the particulars of the behavior specifically. Dr. Hopkins questioned if this would be a case of paying a penalty prior to being convicted.

MOVED: To accept the Police Chief's recommendation as presented.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Ms. Murphy

VOTE: 3 – 1 (Dr. Hopkins)

Consideration of an alcohol violation for Raj Mini Mart (80 Waverly Street)

Chief Carl read his memorandum to the Board summarizing Raj Mini Mart's violation of the Town's Alcohol Policy on October 22, 2004. The PD's recommendation was:

1. A three-day suspension of the license.
2. A \$300.00 cost for the investigation.
3. Manager to make sure that all servers were trained and registered with the PD.
4. Proper signage posted on the premises during the suspension period indicating the charged violation that was the cause of the suspension.

Mr. Desai agreed with the terms of the agreement. Mr. Sisitsky questioned why it would be a mitigating factor to have the owner/manager present, and Chief Carl responded that because he was certified by the PD it represented a mitigating factor.

Dr. Hopkins questioned some typographical errors in the report, and Chief Carl confirmed for her that the establishment had a wine/malt license, not an all alcohol license.

MOVED: To accept the Police Chief's recommendation as presented.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Ms. Murphy

VOTE: 4 – 0

Consideration of an alcohol violation for M&M Inc. (21 Temple Street)

Chief Carl read his memorandum to the Board summarizing M&M Inc.'s violation of the Town's Alcohol Policy on October 22, 2004. The PD's recommendation was:

1. A three-day suspension of the license.
2. A \$300.00 cost for the investigation.
3. Manager to make sure that all servers were trained and registered with the PD.
4. Proper signage posted on the premises during the suspension period indicating the charged violation that was the cause of the suspension.

Mr. Chiappini apologized to the Board, the PD, and MADD explaining that it was the manager's second day on duty, although he admitted that was not any excuse. He took full responsibility, and he wanted to impress upon the Board his seriousness in this matter, and discussed his own past experience with TIPS and alcohol awareness.

Dr. Hopkins wondered what happened to the alcohol and money, and Chief Carl explained that the alcohol was tagged for evidence, and the money came from a special fund. Dr. Hopkins questioned whether the money replenished the fund, and Chief Carl explained it was placed into the General Fund from which the PD budget was ultimately derived.

MOVED: To accept the recommendation of the Police Chief as presented.

Motion: Dr. Hopkins

Second: Ms. Murphy

VOTE: 4 – 0

Mr. Sisitsky questioned how many licensed locations had been visited on October 22, 2005, and the Chief noted that these were the only 2 violations out of 21 establishments visited.

Consideration of a request to extend hours for Dom's Variety Store (269 Hollis Street)

Mr. Patel was present on behalf of Dom's Variety Store. Dom's was seeking an extension of their hours until 11:00 PM Monday through Saturday. Mr. Ross noted that he lived nearby the establishment and commented that it would be convenience to the neighborhood since no other establishment was nearby. Mr. Sisitsky commented that it wasn't a large increase in hours, and moved approval, with Ms. Murphy seconding.

MOVED: To approve the request to extend the hours for Dom's Variety Store.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Ms. Murphy

VOTE: 4 – 0

Consideration of a request to change hours for Framingham Pizza (193 Concord Street)

Mr. Saad Sourial was present to represent Framingham Pizza. He explained that he had received multiple calls from the college neighborhood for extended hours. Mr. Sisitsky pointed out that it was only a Common Victualer license, not a liquor license.

MOVED: To approve the change of hours for Framingham Pizza.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky
VOTE: 4 – 0

Second: Dr. Hopkins

Consideration of a request to transfer a Common Victualer license to Tango Pizza (51 Hollis Street)

Mr. David Presutti was present to represent Tango Pizza. He clarified for the Board that an agreement had been entered into a year prior, but that the transfer had not yet occurred. He thanked the Town for all of its help, particularly Ms. Maryellen Rupp for her help in navigating this process. Ms. Murphy thanked him for his kind words for Town staff. Mr. Ross encouraged him to write a letter of commendation for Ms. Rupp.

MOVED: To approve the transfer of the CV license to Tango Pizza.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Ms. Murphy

VOTE: 4 – 0

Consideration of a request for a livery license for Addisu Limo Service (166 Irving Street)

Mr. Addisu Haile thanked the Town for giving him the opportunity to open a business. He noted that he would be the sole proprietor, and there would be only one vehicle that would operate only on a call basis. Mr. Sisitsky noted the paperwork seemed to be in order. Dr. Hopkins questioned how many livery licenses there were in Town, and Mr. Purple said he would look into the matter.

MOVED: To grant the livery license for Addisu Limo Service

Motion: Ms. Murphy

Second: Dr. Hopkins

VOTE: 4 – 0

Framingham Community Health Center Update – Pam Helmold

The CEO for the Framingham Community Health Center (FCHC) made a presentation to the Board. She noted that federal funding for the FCHC was part of the President's initiative to double the number of community health centers in the country. The FCHC would bring new resources into the community, including \$650,000 per year from DHHS. By the end of 2006, over 6,000 people in need would receive medical, dental, and eye care, 1,200 children would receive immunizations, 4,800 uninsured people would receive health care, and over 20,000 prescriptions would be filled at affordable prices. Framingham received this grant for several reasons:

- It was designated as a medically underserved area (MUA)
- The 1990-2000 census indicated that the low income population grew by 42%, and the low income population made up 21% of the community according to the 2000 census
- The infant mortality rate in Framingham was 8.9/1000, while the county rate was 4.1/1000
- The low birth weight rate in Framingham was 8.0/1000, while the county rate was 7.0/1000
- The diabetes rate in Framingham was 108/1000, while the county rate was 101/1000

- The asthma rate in Framingham was 127/1000, while the county rate was 109/1000
- The teen pregnancy rate in Framingham was 4.5/1000, while the county rate was 3.0/1000
- The rate of respiratory infection in Framingham was 105/1000, while the county rate was 93/1000

Ms. Helmold reviewed the accomplishments of the FCHC from March 2004 through December 2004 noting:

- Of 13 staff members 5 staff members spoke 3 languages and 6 staff members speaking 2 languages
- 1,765 people received 4,130 medical visits
- 65% of people seen were female
- 70% were residents of Framingham
- 21% were children under 19 years old
- 82% had no health insurance
- FCHC had received JCAHO Accreditation

She noted that the FCHC provided excellent access for new patients, and noted that people came to the FCHC for:

- General Health Exams
- Hypertension
- Routine Child Exams
- Diabetes
- Family Planning

Mr. Sisitsky thanked the presenters for their time, and thought the center was good for the community. He questioned whether fewer people were using the hospitals emergency room for routine health care with the advent of this center. He thought that one of their goals was to reduce the workload of the emergency room. Mr. Sisitsky expressed surprise that the grant was not a carryover grant, but required reapplication each year. The FCHC was very severely regulated because the funds were federal, so yearly reapplication was necessary, but they were very competitive, and felt they could secure the grant each year. They noted they had been delayed in opening a new permanent location due to the parking requirements. Mr. Sisitsky questioned the status of the solution proposed by the Town Manager to the parking concern.

Dr. Hopkins asked what the agreement was with the Medical Center. They had a memorandum of understanding of how they would collaborate in terms of accepting clients on referral from one another. The health center needed to be located in the medically underserved area (MUA). Dr. Hopkins asked who was eligible for services at the center, and was told that everyone was, but their target was for underprivileged individuals. Individuals, not the insurance companies received discounts from the FCHC. FCHC provided services to anyone regardless of income basis. The issue was not that FCHC provided services only to those who met a certain standard of poverty, but rather that they provided a sliding scale to clients based upon income. The scale was based

upon income and number of people in the household. Dr. Hopkins questioned if FCHC separated in any way citizens from illegal residents, and they informed the Board that they did not ask for proof of citizenship. Their business was providing health care to all residents.

Ms. Murphy asked how people heard about the FCHC. They noted that because of the limited space they were not presently advertising, so FCHC was relying upon word of mouth currently. Moreover, referrals from school nurses and other medical establishments provided further dissemination of the FCHC's services. Ms. Murphy felt that what was being done was a huge investment to the community.

Mr. Ross asked for clarification – if service was provided to walk-ins. They noted that it was an appointment basis, but they would do their best to have walk-in patients be seen by nurses that day. FCHC was presently located on Concord Street near the Salvation Army.

Dr. Hopkins asked what services “family planning” referred to, and what limitations they were under because of the federal funding. They noted that federal funding allowed it to happen, and the only restriction was the disallowance of terminations. They were required to give patients all options of birth control and allow them to decide what to do.

Consideration of new bond and BAN – Dennis O'Neil, Treasurer

Mr. O'Neil apologized for not giving the information to the Board sooner, but that the time-frame was extremely tight. UBS Financial Services had won the bid. Four certificates would be signed relating to the minutes, and 20 bonds would be signed. Mr. King noted read the list of 16 projects that would be covered, and the amounts:

1. High school project - \$3M
2. Sewer - \$51.8K
3. Water Mains - \$13.3K
4. Roads - \$18.4K
5. Parks - \$105.2K
6. Boiler Replacement - \$44K
7. Boiler- School - \$83.7K
8. Water Mains - \$1M
9. Sewer - \$625K
10. Senior Center - \$1.4M
11. Rubbish Packer - \$70.7K
12. School Roof - \$1.6M
13. Water Mains - \$200K
14. Water Mains - \$200K
15. Water Hydrants - \$405K
16. Fire Pumper - \$430K

MOVED: To adopt the following language into the meeting minutes:

VOTED: That all action taken by the Town Treasurer in advertising for public sale of the \$9,202,000 General Obligation Bonds (the “Bonds”) of the Town authorized under Chapter 44, Sections 7, 8, and 16 of the Massachusetts General Laws, as amended and supplemented, and by votes of the Town duly adopted as further described in Exhibit A attached hereto, which by reference thereto is hereby incorporated in and made a part of the minutes of this meeting and this vote, and, in that connection preparing and distributing a Preliminary Official Statement and Notice of Sale and a final Official Statement, be and hereby is ratified, confirmed, approved and adopted;

That the Bonds shall be dated as of March 1, 2005, payable on March 1 in each of the years as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>
2006	\$632,000	2016	\$400,000
2007	\$600,000	2017	\$400,000
2008	\$600,000	2018	\$400,000
2009	\$600,000	2019	\$400,000
2010	\$570,000	2020	\$400,000
2011	\$470,000	2021	\$400,000
2012	\$470,000	2022	\$400,000
2013	\$470,000	2023	\$400,000
2014	\$470,000	2024	\$400,000
2015	\$470,000	2025	\$250,000

That the Bonds shall be in the denomination of \$5,000 or any authorized multiple thereof, and shall be numbered consecutively; and subject to the provisions of this Vote, the Bonds shall be in such form as the Treasurer and a majority of the Selectmen shall determine or approve by their execution of the Bonds;

That it is hereby determined, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 44, section 7(9) of the General Laws, as amended, that any departmental equipment to be acquired with proceeds of the Bonds, will have a maximum useful life of 15 years;

That the Bonds shall be a consolidated issue of the bonds described in Exhibit A, and shall mature as described in Exhibit B, which by reference thereto is hereby incorporated in and made part of the minutes of this meeting and this vote;

The Bonds maturing on and before March 1, 2015 are not subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity dates. The Bonds maturing on and after March 1, 2016 are subject to redemption prior to their stated maturity dates, at the option of the Town, on and after March 1, 2015, either in whole or in part at any time, and if in part, by lot within a maturity, at the par amount of the Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest to the date set for redemption.

That the Bonds shall originally be issued by means of a book-entry system evidencing ownership and transfer of the Bonds; and in the event of failure or termination of the book-entry system, U.S. Bank National Association, Boston, Massachusetts, shall issue replacement bonds in the form of fully registered certificates and shall act as Bond Registrar, Transfer Agent and Paying Agent, therefore;

That the Bonds maturing in each respective year shall bear interest payable on March 1 and September 1 in each year, commencing September 1, 2005, at the respective rates per annum as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>
2006	\$632,000	4.50%	2016	\$400,000	3.625%
2007	\$600,000	3.25%	2017	\$400,000	3.75%
2008	\$600,000	3.00%	2018	\$400,000	3.75%
2009	\$600,000	3.00%	2019	\$400,000	4.00%
2010	\$570,000	3.125%	2020	\$400,000	4.00%
2011	\$470,000	3.25%	2021	\$400,000	4.00%
2012	\$470,000	3.25%	2022	\$400,000	4.00%
2013	\$470,000	4.50%	2023	\$400,000	4.00%
2014	\$470,000	3.50%	2024	\$400,000	4.00%
2015	\$470,000	3.50%	2025	\$250,000	4.00%

That the bid of **UBS Financial Services Inc.**, to purchase the Bonds at a price of **\$9,202,041.58** and interest accrued to date of delivery, resulting in a net interest cost of **\$3,287,577.50** and a true interest rate of **3.1782268%**, being the best bid received for the Bonds, bearing interest at the lowest true interest cost, be and it hereby is accepted, and the Town Treasurer be and hereby is authorized to deliver the Bonds to the aforesaid purchaser or order against payment therefore;

That the Treasurer be, and hereby is, authorized to execute and deliver a continuing disclosure undertaking in compliance with SEC Rule 15c2-12 in such form as may be approved by bond council and as generally described in the Official Statement relating to the Bonds and to incorporate by reference thereto in each Bond the form of such undertaking and the obligation of the Town contained in such undertaking, is hereby approved and confirmed; and

That the Bonds to be issued pursuant to this vote may be secured by insurance or by letter or lines of credit or other credit facilities in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 44, Section 22C, of the General Laws, as the Treasurer or Finance Director, as appropriate, shall determine, and the Board of Selectmen, the Treasurer and the Town Clerk be and hereby are, and each of them severally is authorized to contract for and purchase, if necessary, any policy of municipal bond insurance with respect to the Bonds, and each such officer may take all such action, and execute and deliver such certificates, receipts, or other documents as may be determined by them, or any of them, to be necessary or convenient to carry into effect the provisions of the foregoing Vote.”

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky
VOTE: 4 – 0

Second: Ms. Murphy

Consideration of Government Study Committee (GSC) Request

Ms. Christine Long, Chair of the GSC, explained that they were conducting a comprehensive review of the Town's governmental structure, beginning with the Town Manager Act (TMA). The GSC had contacted other communities, and then voted 7 – 3 to request that the Board place on the ballot a non-binding, advisory question with regards to the TMA to help the GSC narrow its focus. The proposed questions were:

1. The effectiveness and operation of Framingham Town Meeting, the legislative branch of local government is:
 - Satisfactory
 - Unsatisfactory
 - Don't Know
2. The effectiveness and operation of the Board of Selectmen, the executive branch of local government is:
 - Satisfactory
 - Unsatisfactory
 - Don't Know
3. The effectiveness and operation of the Town Manager's Office, the administrative branch of local government, is:
 - Satisfactory
 - Unsatisfactory
 - Don't Know

The GSC was aware of severe time constraints, namely that the ballot question was required to be voted by the Board 5 weeks prior to the election, namely, by March 1, 2005.

Dr. Hopkins asked if the questions had been validated by testing them upon a small group to ensure the questions are understood and answered properly. Ms. Long admitted that the questions had not been posed to anyone as of yet. Mr. Sisitsky noted that there already were very well publicized and televised public hearings to give everyone an opportunity to explain their feelings. He was curious how the results of these questions would be used to help the committee. He was concerned about the generality of the question, and how they would help, since the results could be very widely interpreted. Ms. Long opined that results would help the GSC determine which part of the government was least effective.

Mr. Joel Winett felt that one of the problems with the hearings was that the people who were present were insiders, and the responses were provided by a small and biased group. To do any kind of survey would require a reasonable number of participants. He believed about 20% or so would respond "don't know."

Ms. Murphy agreed that she was uncertain how these questioned as phrased would provide any useful information. People might not even have an understanding of what

they were answering. She agreed that the portions of the GSC public hearings that she had attended were not representative of the Town.

Dr. Hopkins asked if the GSC would be willing to “do some hard work,” by validating the questions and then calling a randomized sampling of the voter list. Ms. Long expressed concern that there were no hard copy results if a phone survey were conducted.

Mr. Douglas Freeman explained that originally the concept for a valid question was to give guidance to the GSC, and his concept was completely different. It was to address the issue of a Charter Commission, which he was in favor of, but the majority of the GSC did not favor that approach. He noted that the intent was not to interpret the results, but to receive general direction about what areas needed improvement. Mr. Ross questioned that there were only three options, and no category for “excellent.” The GSC had discussed the multiple choice options carefully, and had ultimately decided on the final form. Mr. Ross agreed with his other Board members that the data received from the survey as posed would not be accurate or provide useful results.

Ms. Murphy felt that a lot of hard work had gone into the public hearings and questioned if the sparse attendance of the hearings indicated satisfaction. Mr. Freeman agreed that was a possible interpretation, but it could also be interpreted as a disengagement or a dissatisfaction with the government.

Mr. Sisitsky felt that what the GSC was undertaking was very important and complicated, but felt that a more scientific survey to a random set of voters would yield better results. He suggested doing further research to determine the cost of such a survey and then ask Town Meeting for an appropriation. Mr. Freeman felt that that would be a long-term approach, and the proposal before the Board was a more immediate approach to gain information quickly.

Mr. Freeman expressed concern that those in the government were afraid of evaluation.

Ms. Cathie McCarthy felt that the GSC did a good job conducting the public hearings. She thought there should be a middle response, and suggested tweaking the questions to provide a result that could be interpreted accurately.

Ms. Murphy responded to Mr. Freeman’s earlier comments about government’s fear of evaluation by clarifying that it was not her concern to receive unsatisfactory marks, but rather that results from the questions as presented might not be helpful and subject to interpretation. Mr. Sisitsky felt that while the Board might not support this survey, if the GSC were to conduct research and ask Town Meeting for an appropriation to fund a comprehensive survey, the Board would support them.

Consideration of Town Owned Buildings report follow up

Mr. King noted that he had responded to Ms. Murphy’s inquiries from the previous week by developing a memorandum, which he had sent to the Board.

Mr. King's recommendation was to reserve an article for the Annual Town Meeting, allowing the report of the task force to be heard. At that time allow Town Meeting to debate a resolution type motion endorsing the overall concept of the report.

Dr. Hopkins felt the recommendation was worthwhile, and made the motion, seconded by Mr. Sisitsky. He suggested also sending copies of the Town Owned Building Report to the Real Property Committee with a cover memo explaining the proposed recommendation.

MOVED: To follow the recommendation of the Town Manager, and to communicate with the Real Property Committee on this matter.

Motion: Dr. Hopkins

Second: Mr. Sisitsky

VOTE: 4 – 0

Closing of the Special Town Meeting Warrants

Mr. King noted that two warrants had been prepared at the Board's direction.

First: Report to STM on the budget. BOS agreed. Dr. Hopkins questioned if the Library would only be given 10 minutes since they were the reason for calling the meeting. Mr. King acknowledged that that was the rule, but that Town Meeting typically voted to allow more time for discussion.

Second: Mr. King drew the Board's attention to the late submissions. He asked why the Rules Committee wanted these articles to be submitted for STM and not ATM. Mr. Winett spoke about the matter, noting that one article would provide that any special appropriations made would require an annual report. This would have implications for the library project, should it receive an appropriation. Mr. King pointed out that because these were general by-laws, they would require Attorney General approval, and so wouldn't apply to library article if it passed. He suggested appending a motion to the library article requiring such an annual report. Mr. Sisitsky commented that the time schedule for STM was tight, and he was wary of adding to the warrant. Mr. Winett suggested moving the library article to being first, and Mr. King agreed that that might be a good idea.

MOVED: That the current Article 7 be renumbered Article 1 for the STM scheduled for March 15, 2005, that all other articles be renumbered accordingly, and that the warrant be closed.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Dr. Hopkins

VOTE: 4 – 0

MOVED: To accept the Rules Committee four articles and add them to the STM warrant for March 17, 2005, and to close the warrant.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Dr. Hopkins

VOTE: 4 – 0

The Manager confirmed for Mr. Sisitsky that all articles needed to be submitted as written, despite grammatical errors or illegality.

Request for location by NSTAR

Mr. Purple noted that NSTAR had requested a grant of location for the Doeskin water project. It would be for a metering enclosure off Carter Drive to supply the electricity used to connect the pump station and the water tank. Mr. King noted that it was a small enclosure on Town property, and he would confirm that it would be in the woods.

MOVED: To approve the grant of location.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Dr. Hopkins

VOTE: 4 – 0

The Chair called recess at 9:47 PM and called the meeting back to order at 9:57 PM.

FY 06 Operating Budget Update

Mr. King informed the Board that the operating budget would be challenging this year. In fact, the total operating budget was estimated at approximately \$173M.

State aid had increased less than \$250K. The Charter School reimbursement formula complicated the end result. The budget was currently built on the free cash policy, and the stabilization fund of \$300K that would be used to supplement the budget. The overlay surplus was another source of recurring revenue that had been used year after year, but this year was a projected \$300K revenue deficit. From a fiscal policy point of view the Town was doing well.

The school budget was projected at \$74.4M, representing an increase of \$1.2M. Town operations were at \$43M, representing an increase of \$776K. Some reductions had been made in the preliminary budget, but it would appear to have a deficit of \$400K. However, in reality the budget would be about \$2M short. The problem was that because the reductions had occurred year after year, the easy cuts were no longer there, and \$2M was much harder to cut than two years ago. Further reductions could be made by eliminating specific programs, as had been looked at in past years, or across the board cuts. That percent would be approximately 2% per department. The proposed budget had no new programs except for the restructuring and expansion of the Planning and Economic Development Department, at the direction of the Board. Mr. King said he had considered phasing in that increase over two years, but he needed to get Board's opinion.

Major concerns were the snow deficit, health insurance increases, the health insurance trust fund, and the overlay account. Another major concern was Keefe Tech. They are looking for a relatively large operating budget increase, and the Town's percentage of enrollment had gone from 72% to 75%. Mr. King stated that he could not at this point carry it any higher in the budget, and he believed that Keefe Tech needed to be convinced to lower its budget request. If the budgets were cut closer and the revenue had decreased, there would then be a concern over future free cash generation.

The real reason for the deficit was a reduction in state aid from FY02 of about \$5.5M. Mr. King felt it was unconscionable of the legislature and governor to divert lottery money, which was not supporting the communities as it should be. Mr. King explained that it was the only source of revenue that had consistently decreased over recent years, where the rest have at least remained level if not increased.

Mr. Sisitsky questioned what numbers were being used for the school side of the budget since the School Committee had not yet completed action on their budget. Mr. King explained that it was developed by formula. Between now and ATM, there was no expected increase in revenue. There was some possibility of an increase, but Mr. King was not overly optimistic. Mr. Sisitsky felt that the preliminary budget discussion to STM would be good to prepare Town Meeting for this at ATM.

Selectmen's Reports

Mr. Sisitsky

Mr. Sisitsky wished to discuss the Boston Properties land-taking. He asked if the town-owned land was necessary for access to the site as proposed, and suggested asking the state legislators to intervene on the Town's behalf by asking MTA to delay any taking of town-owned land, until the Board could look at this project and discuss it in greater depth. He felt that if the project absolutely needed the requested parcel to proceed, then the Town needed to be compensated accordingly. He felt the Town owed it to the taxpayers to maximize the financial benefits of that project.

Ms. Murphy asked if that would have any impact on the Vaillencourt easement. Mr. Sisitsky viewed it as separate issue.

MOVED: To send letters to the state legislators as suggested by Mr. Sisitsky.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Dr. Hopkins

VOTE: 3 – 0 – 1 (Dr. Hopkins)

Dr. Hopkins suggested sending a letter directly to the MTA as well.

Ms. Murphy

Ms. Murphy thanked Mr. King for a document he had given to her about the Texaco station. Ms. Murphy noted that the ad hoc capital projects committee had met again, and that she had been selected as the committee's clerk. She told the Board that there had been some confusion when they had first met about their charge, but the committee had decided to begin by looking at and evaluating the capital budgeting process.

She also told the Board she had met the new director of the Danforth Museum at a reception for her. She thought that Ms. French would be a tremendous benefit to Town.

Mr. Ross

Mr. Ross clarified that he misspoke and that the Wet Shelter's address was 105 Irving Street. But, he did maintain that sex offenders often listed the Wet Shelter's address,

when in fact they had no other address. Mr. Ross also said he would find individuals to invite to the discussion of the sex offender issue planned for a subsequent meeting.

MOVED: To adjourn at 10:30 PM.

Motion: Mr. Sisitsky

Second: Ms. Murphy

VOTE: 4 – 0

Respectfully submitted,

Charles J. Sisitsky, Clerk